



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,112	09/26/2001	Kevin Petty	1060-0004	3952
36291	7590	02/25/2005	EXAMINER	
STEVEN W. SMITH 7237 BIRCHWOOD DRIVE DALLAS, TX 75240			SEFI, BEHROOZ M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2613	

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/965,112

Applicant(s)

PETTY ET AL.

Examiner

Behrooz Senfi

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/26/2001</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 – 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seeley et al (US 6,091,771) in view of Monroe (US 2003/0025599).

Regarding claim 1, Seeley '771 teaches "a transportable security surveillance system for rapid installation in an area of interest" (i.e. fig. 1) and "an audio-video compressor (AVC) in the area of interest" (i.e. fig. 3, device 12) and "video camera in the area of interest" (i.e. fig. 3, camera 14) and "a microphone in the area of interest" (i.e. fig. 3, MIC 52) and "a triggering device in the area of interest" (i.e. fig. 2, sensors S1). Seeley '771 fails to explicitly mention "local area network (LAN)", for connecting a central security station to the area of interest. However, Seeley '771 (i.e. fig. 1, CS) shows the central station comprising router and video server and central alarm computer are interconnected with multiple work-station, all on a common network, such a network could be consider as a local area network (LAN). Furthermore, the supporting reference Monroe '599 (i.e. page 8, section 0112), explicitly mention the use of (LAN) and/or (WLAN) or (WAN), for interconnecting the above monitoring devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use (LAN) as a common local communication network between the devices.

Regarding claim 2, combination of Seeley '771 and Monroe '599 teach, "memory for storing pre-trigger audio and video data" (i.e. page 8, section 0115 of Monroe and figs. 6 and 8, col. 6, lines 34 - 38 of Seeley).

Regarding claims 3 - 4, combination of Seeley '771 and Monroe '599 teach, "triggering device is wired to the AVC" and "triggering device includes a wireless trigger transmitter and a trigger receiver connected to the AVC in claim 4" (i.e. page 3, section 0025 and section 0027 of Monroe).

Regarding claims 5 - 6, combination of Seeley '771 and Monroe '599 teach, "alarm display in the central security station for providing a security guard with the real time audio and video data" (i.e. fig. 1, display 106 of Seeley) and "alarm display also provides instructions to the guard for handling the situation in claim 6" reads on (i.e. abstract, lines 9 - 12 of Seeley and page 16, sections 0210 and 0215 of Monroe).

Regarding claims 7 - 8, combination of Seeley '771 and Monroe '599 teach, "in the central security station, a pager mechanism connected to the central security computer that automatically pages a security supervisor in claim" reads on (i.e. pages 15 - 16, section 0206 - 0208 of Monroe) and "in the security station, an alarm event timer that terminates the streaming of real time audio and video data from the AVC to the central security computer after a predetermined period of time has expired in claim 8" (i.e. page 17, sections 0227 and 0228 of Monroe).

Regarding claims 9 - 10 and 22, combination of Seeley '771 and Monroe '599 teach, "in the central security station, a supervisor override function that enables the supervisor to override the alarm event timer and continue the streaming of real time

Art Unit: 2613

audio and video data” (i.e. page 14, section 0185 of Monroe) and “the AVC includes a reverse audio channel in claims 10 and 22” reads on (i.e. col. 8, lines 44 – 46 of Seeley).

Regarding claims 11 – 13 and 23, combination of Seeley ‘771 and Monroe ‘599 teach, “speaker connected to the AVC, and a second microphone in claims 11 and 23” (i.e. fig. 2 of Seeley, shows multiple microphone and speakers” and as for “the database for storing the real time audio and video data after it is streamed in claim 12” reads on (i.e. fig. 6, data base 116, page 4, sections 0029 and 0032 of Monroe) and “the AVC also includes means for downloading the pre-triggered audio and video data stored in the AVC memory and sending the pre triggered data to the data base in claim 13” reads on (i.e. fig. 1 of Monroe and fig. 8 of Seeley).

Regarding claims 14 - 16, combination of Seeley ‘771 and Monroe ‘599 teach, “time stamp audio and video data” (i.e. page 11, sections 0156 and 0153 of Monroe) and “video cassette recorder in claim 15” reads on (i.e. fig. 7, tape recorder 210 of Monroe) and “wherein the central security computer includes means for preventing the security guard from triggering the AVC to begin streaming real time audio and video data in claim 16” reads on (i.e. page 14, section 0185 of Monroe).

Regarding claim 17 – 19, combination of Seeley ‘771 and Monroe ‘599 teach, “wherein the AVC includes an RS-232 interface” (i.e. page 6, section 0048, lines 8) and as for “wherein the central security computer includes means for sending a command over the LAN to the AVC to activate the remote control device in claim 18” reads on (i.e. pages 10 and 12, sections 0130 and 0159 of Monroe and col. 6, lines 20 –

Art Unit: 2613

25 of Seeley), and as for “remote control door lock for locking a door that provides an entrance and an exit to the area of interest in claim 19” is actually a wireless access control/ keyless entry, which is well known and would have been obvious to combine for wireless interaction purpose. Official Notice

Regarding claim 20, the limitations as claimed are substantially similar to combination of claims 1 and 5, therefore the grounds for rejecting claims 1 and 5 also applies here.

Regarding claim 21, the limitations as claimed are similar to claim 2, therefore the grounds for rejecting claim 2 also applies here.

Regarding claims 25 – 26, the limitations claimed are substantially similar to claim 7, therefore the grounds for rejecting claim 7 also applies here.

Regarding claim 24, combination of Seeley ‘771 and Monroe ‘599 teach, “radio transmitter in the central security station” (i.e. page 2, section 0018).

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Behrooz Senfi** whose telephone number is **(703)305-0132**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, **Chris Kelley** can be reached on **(703)305-4856**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Art Unit: 2613

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relative to the status of the application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

B. S. B. P.

2/9/2005


CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600